

Form A

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

SCH #

Mailto: State Clearinghouse, PO Box 304, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 916/445-0613

Project Title: Major Waste Tire Facility Permit, an upgrade from Minor Permit #19-TI-0681

Lead Agency: Calif. Integrated Waste Management Board

Contact Person: John Loane

Street Address: P.O. Box 4025

Phone: (916) 341-6327 fax 341-6325

City: Sacramento

Zip: 95812-4025

County: Sacramento

Project Location:

County: Los Angeles

City/Nearest Community: Los Angeles

Cross Streets: 3185 East Washington Boulevard

Zip Code: 90023

Total Acres: 2.72

Assessor's Parcel No.: 96-000-5169-020-005

Section:

Twp.

Range:

Base:

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 5

Waterways:

Airports:

Railways:

Schools:

Document Type:

CEQA:

☐ NOP

☐ Early Cons

☒ Negative De c

☐ Draft EIR

☐ Supplement/Subsequent EIR

(Prior SCH No.)

☐ Other

NEPA:

☐ NOI

☐ EA

☐ Draft EIS


☐ FONSI

Other:

☐ Joint Document

☐ Final Document

☐ Other



Local Action Type:

☐ General Plan Update

☐ General Plan Amendment

☐ General Plan Element

☐ Community Plan

☐ Specific Plan

☐ Master Plan

☐ Planned Unit Development

☐ Site Plan

☐ Rezone

☐ Prezone

☐ Use Permit

☐ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)

☐ Annexation

☐ Redevelopment

☐ Coastal Permit

☐ Other

Development Type:

☐ Residential: Units _____ Acres _____

☐ Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____

☐ Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____

☐ Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____

☐ Educational

☐ Recreational

☐ Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD

☐ Transportation: Type _____

☐ Mining: Mineral _____

☐ Power: Type _____ Watts _____

☐ Waste Treatment: Type _____

☐ Hazardous Waste: Type _____

☐ Other: _____

Funding (approx.):

Federal \$ _____

State \$ _____

Total \$ _____

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

☐ Aesthetic/Visual

☐ Agricultural Land

☒ Air Quality

☐ Archeological/Historical

☐ Coastal Zone

☐ Drainage/Absorption

☐ Economic/Jobs

☐ Fiscal

☐ Flood Plain/Flooding

☐ Forest Land/Fire Hazard

☒ Geologic/Seismic

☐ Minerals

☒ Noise

☐ Population/Housing Balance

☐ Public Services/Facilities

☐ Recreation/Parks

☐ Schools/Universities

☐ Septic Systems

☐ Sewer Capacity

☐ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading

☐ Solid Waste

☐ Toxic/Hazardous

☒ Traffic/Circulation

☐ Vegetation

☐ Water Quality

☐ Water Supply/Groundwater

☐ Wetland/Riparian

☐ Wildlife

☐ Growth Inducing

☐ Land Use

☐ Cumulative Effects

☐ Other

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

M3-1

Project Description: Approval of a Major Waste Tire Facility Permit for the expansion of the Rubber Technology International, Inc. site from 2.0 acres to 2.72 acres and storage capacity from 4,999 tires to 30,000 tires on-site.

Revised 3-31-99

Reviewing Agencies Check list

Form A, continued

KEY

S= Documents sent by lead agency
X= Documents sent by S CH
/= Suggested distribution

☒ Resources Agency

☐ Boating & Waterways

☐ Coastal Commission

☐ Coastal Conservancy

☐ Colorado River Board

☒ Conservation

☒ Fish & Game

☒ Forestry & Fire Protection

☐ Office of Historic Preservation

☒ Parks & Recreation

☐ Reclamation Board

☐ S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission

☒ Water Resources (DWR)

Business, Transportation & Housing

☐ Aeronautics

☐ California Highway Patrol

☒ CALTRANS District # _____

☐ Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)

☐ Housing & Community Development

☐ Food & Agriculture

Health & Welfare

☒ Health Services _____

State & Consumer Services

☐ General Services

☐ OLA (Schools)

☒ City of L.A. att: Sonny Dwyer
Solid Waste, Sanitation
4590 Colorado Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90039-0000

Environmental Protection Agency

☒ Air Resources Board QMD, South Coast

☒ California Waste Management Board

☐ SWRCB: Clean Water Grants

☐ SWRCB: Delta Unit

☒ SWRCB: Water Quality

☐ SWRCB: Water Rights

☐ Regional WQCB# _____ (_____)

Youth & Adult Corrections

☐ Corrections

Independent Commissions & Offices

☐ Energy Commission

☐ Native American Heritage Commission

☐ Public Utilities Commission

☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy

☐ State Lands Commission

☐ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

☒ Other Fire Dept. att: Marcus Look
200 North Main St., Rm. 970
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date _____

Ending Date _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Contact: _____

Phone: (_____) _____

Applicant: Rubber Technology International, Inc.

Address: 3185 East Washington Blvd.

City/State/Zip: Los Angeles, CA 90023

Phone: (323) 268-6842

For SCH Use Only:

Date Received at SCH _____

Date Review Starts _____

Date to Agencies _____

Date to SCH _____

Clearance Date _____

Notes:

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2000121044
Project Title Major Waste Tire Facility Permit, an Upgrade From Minor Permit #19-TI-0681
Lead Agency California Integrated Waste Management Board

Type Neg Negative Declaration
Description Approval of a Major Waste Tire Facility Permit for the expansion Rubber Technology International, Inc. site from 2.0 acres to 2.72 acres and storage capacity from 4,999 tires to 30,000 tires on-site.

Lead Agency Contact

Name John Loane
Agency Integrated Waste Management Board
Phone 916/341-6327 **Fax**
email
Address P.O. Box 4025
City Sacramento **State** CA **Zip** 95812-4025

Project Location

County Los Angeles
City Los Angeles, City of
Region
Cross Streets East Washington Boulevard
Parcel No. 98-000-5169-020-008
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways 5
Airports
Railways
Waterways
Schools
Land Use M3-1

Project Issues Air Quality; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Traffic/Circulation

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Department of Parks and Recreation; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Department of Health Services; Integrated Waste Management Board; State Water Resources Control Board, Clean Water Program; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; State Lands Commission

Date Received 12/13/2000 **Start of Review** 12/13/2000 **End of Review** 01/11/2001

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2000121044
Project Title Major Waste Tire Facility Permit, an Upgrade From Minor Permit #19-TI-0681
Lead Agency California Integrated Waste Management Board

Type Neg Negative Declaration
Description Approval of a Major Waste Tire Facility Permit for the expansion Rubber Technology International, Inc. site from 2.0 acres to 2.72 acres and storage capacity from 4,999 tires to 30,000 tires on-site.

Lead Agency Contact

Name John Loane
Agency Integrated Waste Management Board
Phone 916/341-6327 **Fax**
email
Address P.O. Box 4025
City Sacramento **State** CA **Zip** 95812-4025

Project Location

County Los Angeles
City Los Angeles, City of
Region
Cross Streets East Washington Boulevard
Parcel No. 96-000-5169-020-008
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways 5
Airports
Railways
Waterways
Schools
Land Use M3-1

Project Issues Air Quality; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Traffic/Circulation

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Department of Parks and Recreation; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Department of Health Services; Integrated Waste Management Board; State Water Resources Control Board, Clean Water Program; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; State Lands Commission

Date Received 12/13/2000 **Start of Review** 12/13/2000 **End of Review** 01/11/2001

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY FOR PUBLIC & AGENCY REVIEW

This is to advise that the California Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMB or Board) has prepared a Negative Declaration (ND) for the project identified below. As mandated by State law, the minimum public review period for this document is 30 days. The document and documents referenced in the proposed ND are available for review at the Department of City Planning, City of Los Angeles, 221 South Figueroa Street, Suite 310, Los Angeles, California 90012 or by calling John Loane of the IWMB at (916) 341-6327.

A public hearing has been scheduled with the Board to receive comments on the ND on: January 23 or 24, 2001, at 9:30 a.m. or soon thereafter, Air Resources Board, 2020 L Street in Sacramento, California 95812.

The comment period for this document closes on January 11, 2001. Testimony at future public hearings may be limited to those issues raised during the public review period either orally or submitted in writing by 5:00 p.m. the day the comment period closes.

Project Title: Approval of a new Waste Tire Facility Permit #19-TI-0681. This reflects a change from a Minor Waste Tire Facility to a Major Waste Tire Facility.

Lead Agency Name and Address: California Integrated Waste Management Board
1001 I Street
P.O. Box 4025
Sacramento, California 95812-4025
Contact: John Loane
(916) 341-6327

Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Rubber Technology International, Inc.
3185 East Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90023
Contact: Fred Schmidt
(323) 268-6842

Project Location: 3185 East Washington Boulevard in the city and county of Los Angeles.
Latitude: 34.015350
Longitude: -118.210516
Assessor's Parcel Number 96-000-5169-020-003

General Plan Designation: Heavy Manufacturing

Zoning: M3-1

South and East Boundaries City of Vernon

Surrounding Land Uses: North – Union Pacific Railroad Tracks and Yard
South – Street access East Washington Blvd.,
across street: Arcadia Manufacturing. /Hotel Surplus Outlet
East -- Arcadia Steel Fabrication Manufacturing
West -- The Tarrant Group, a textile manufacturing

Nearest Sensitive Receptor: Residence approximately 1,800 feet from the RTI facility,
direct line, due north, at the corner of Olympic Blvd. and Grande Vista.

Nearest Fire Stations (refer to road map):

- A) 1601 S. Santa Fe (approx. two miles from the facility)
- B) 4530 Bandini Blvd.
- C) 1967 E. Caesar Chavez, also a battalion headquarters
- D) 2927 Whittier Blvd.

Rubber Technology International, Inc. Major Tire Facility Permit

Project Description:

The primary project addressed by this California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review is the proposed California Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMB) approval of a Major Waste Tire Facility (Major) Permit for the storage of waste tires at the Rubber Technology International, Inc. (RTI) facility located at 3185 East Washington Boulevard in Los Angeles. The area is zoned specifically for 'Heavy Manufacturing' (M3-1) in the Los Angeles General Plan. RTI has been operating under Minor Waste Tire Facility (Minor) Permit No. 19-TI-0681 issued by the IWMB on April 30, 1999. Under the 'Minor' Permit, the facility has been operating on 2.0 acres at the maximum allowable capacity of 4,999 tires. The following changes to this 'Minor' Permit constitute the 'project' proposal for which a 'Major' Permit and CEQA review is required:

- 1) an increase in the facility's site acreage from 2.0 to 2.72 acres, and
- 2) an increase in the number of tires stored on site from 4,999 to 30,000 tires.

Project Site:

The proposed facility is located on approximately 80,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of an 118,754 square foot (sq. ft.) parcel. The entire site gently slopes in a southerly direction toward East Washington Boulevard. Of the 80,000 sq. ft., approximately 19,518 sq. ft. of the property is covered by a fully enclosed industrial building and a separate smaller office. The office is located in an east-west direction along the southern property boundary and parallel to East Washington Boulevard to the west of the facility's entrance. The industrial building is located approximately 40 feet behind the office building along the entire length of the western property boundary. The industrial building is the main tire processing area. In addition, the building contains a storage area adjacent to the washroom facilities where tools, equipment parts and supplies, and small quantities of chemicals for cleaning, maintenance, and mold binding are kept. In the area adjacent to the southern exit door of the industrial building the end products from the tire processing are kept both outside and inside prior to shipment. The industrial building is built on a concrete pad. The building maintains a negative pressure ventilation system to collect indoor dust particles (particulates), which are funneled through a chimney to a metal bin outside waiting disposal. The outdoor 'storage' area contains piles of whole tires, chipped tires, and metal fragments which have been removed from processed tires. The outdoor area entirely paved with asphalt and rainwater is directed down slope southward and towards East Washington Boulevard where the surface water runoff drains into the City's storm water collection system.

Project Operations:

RTI, Inc. is a company that processes waste tires into two sizes of crumb rubber and manufactures molded rubber products for sale. Waste tires brought to the facility are stored on site and processed into saleable products during operating hours. The whole tires are initially cut into approximately two-inch strips or chips, which are then fed into a 'cracker' or 'rasper' where they are further reduced in size. It is during this first processing phase when the metal contained in the tire belts is removed by magnets along the conveyor. This metal is stored in piles until it is either disposed or sold for use in other manufacturing processes. After the tires have been rasped into a smaller granular size, they are conveyed inside the industrial building for further size reduction and size separation. The size separation process is accomplished by screening the crumb rubber into No. 10 mesh through No. 40 mesh particle sizes. It is these granulated sizes that can either be sold directly, or processed into molded products on-site. The No. 10 through No. 40 crumb rubber are placed into large industrial sized nylon bags and stored until sold and transported off site. RTI also produces a product within the industrial building which involves a binding and molding process. The manufacturing of this product utilizes crumb rubber in association with a binding agent which is then pressed into the mold until it forms a solid. Currently the molded product that RTI manufactures is 8, 10, and 12 pound traffic delineator bases that hold reflector road markers.

Other equipment used outside to manage the tire storage piles, both for processing as well as safety, include a fork lift and a tractor. At full operational capacity the company will employ a maximum of 40 employees.

Hours of Operations:

Operational hours are Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 8:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. on Saturdays; the facility is closed on Sundays and holidays. Occasionally the processing lines will process tires into crumb rubber 24 hours per day. The site is occupied by an attendant from 5:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. daily. The site security is a chain link fence that surrounds the entire site with a gated entrance.

Tire Storage:

According to the Operation Plan (IWMB Form 501), and the site plan submitted with the Emergency Action Plan, the tires will be stored in four individual piles with a maximum height of 10 feet. Maximum volume of the four piles is estimated to be 3,000 cubic yards. Since the piles may include either whole or shredded tires, and whole and shredded tires have different conversion factors for the number of tires per cubic foot, it is difficult to estimate the maximum number of tires that will be on site at any one time. The Operation Plan indicates that the maximum number of tires will be 30,000 tires.

Operational Safety:

The industrial building has a washroom/shower area that is attached to the building structure on the east side. Hygienic facilities and safety equipment are located within the washroom area. Immediately outside the washroom area is where the ancillary supplies are stored. Potable city water is supplied to the site, which can be used for hygiene, drinking and dust suppression throughout the site. A fire hydrant is located immediately outside the southern boundary which has a discharge capacity of 3,100 gallons per minute. The site has 25 fire extinguishers located throughout the facility.

All tire storage will be in conformance with the Waste Tire Storage and Disposal Standards in the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Chapter 3, Article 5.5, Sections 17350 through 17354. RTI's Emergency Response Plan (attachment) and the Operation Plan (attachment) contains provisions for the protection of public health and safety, and the environment from impacts related to tire storage, and the threat of fire in tire stockpiles.

REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Under Chapter 16 of the California Public Resources Code (PRC), the California Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMB) has the responsibility for the administration of waste tire programs. Under the related California Code of Regulation, Chapter 5 Permitting of Waste Tires the IWMB has the authority to require and issue Major Waste Tire Facility Permit for facilities that store 5,000 or more waste tires. Waste Tire Standards regulated by the IWMB are contained in CCR, Chapter 3, Article 5.5, Sections 17350 through 17354.

IWMB PROJECT CONTACT PERSONS

The preparer and contact person for this ND is: John A. Loane, Jr., Integrated Waste Management Specialist, Environmental Review Section (ERS) of the California Integrated Waste Management Board.

SUMMARY

Comments and suggestions from citizens of Los Angeles, Responsible Agencies, and other interested agencies are hereby solicited for this proposed project. These comments and suggestions should help the IWMB (Lead Agency) ensure that the environmental decision will be determined based on information and identification of potential significant environmental effects that might result from this project proposal. The Lead Agency will consider comments along with the ND and vote on adoption of the ND and the issuance of Waste Tire Facility Permit No. 19-TI-0681.

Please submit your written comments to this office at the above address no later than January 12, 2000. Comments received after this date may not be considered by the IWMB prior to project approval.


EXPLANATION OF THE CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AT THE RUBBER TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL, INC.:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063.5(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.



- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND ANALYSIS

An ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM is attached to this Initial Study that lists, in matrix form, the potential for significant environmental impacts that could result from the implementation of this proposed project. This form also includes an ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST ANALYSIS that analyses the potential for these effects and presents findings made by the Lead Agency.



EMERGENCY RESPONSE
EXHIBIT A



ONE INCH = 150 FEET



FIRE HYDRANT - CITY SERVICE



MAIN ELECTRIC METER AND
POWER SHUT-OFF




POTENTIAL TIRE PILE. ALL MEETING
REQUIREMENTS OF ARTICLE 17354 TITLE 14

FIRE LINES AS NOTED



SEE APPENDIX 15 OF OPERATION PLAN

ONE WAY & GO FERRY



Environmental Checklist and Environmental Checklist Analysis

The level of analysis that CEQA requires depends upon the apparent potential for the project to cause harm to the physical environment in and around the location of the proposed project. Under the CEQA *Guidelines* (Section 15063), if the lead agency determines that there is substantial evidence that any aspect of the project proposal, either individually or cumulatively, may cause a significant negative effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared. If, however, an initial environmental study (Initial Study) indicates that the project will not produce significant environmental impacts, or if potentially significant impacts are identified, but the project applicant agrees to alter the project in order to avoid or mitigate the effects to the point where clearly no significant effects would occur, then CEQA allows the adoption of a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no EIR is required (CEQA *Guidelines*, Section 15070).

The Initial Study presented in this document did not identify any potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed project. The project as proposed would result in only minor environmental effects. Therefore, the appropriate level of CEQA review is an Initial Study and negative declaration.

This document describes the proposed project and discusses and analyzes each area that the potential for impact is less than significant.

TABLE 1-1 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
native wildlife nursery sites?				
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in ' 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to ' 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
-- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region, and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE B Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIV. RECREATION --

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
solid waste disposal needs?				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST ANALYSIS


DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an

- ☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


Signature

December 12, 2000
Date

Signature

Date

Rubber Technology International, Inc.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST EXPLANATION ATTACHMENT

I **AESTHETICS (No Impact).** The RTI facility is currently operating in an area of the city that is designated in the General Plan for 'Heavy Manufacturing' (Zone M3-1). The Rubber Technology International, Inc. (RTI) facility is representative of the facilities within the M3-1 Zone. No new buildings or structures are proposed for construction on site.

II **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES (No Impact).** There are no potential agricultural resources at the RTI because it is located in an industrial area. The RTI facility is 100% developed and contains no area on site where soils are exposed; the entire site is paved over.

III c) **AIR QUALITY (Less Than Significant Impact).** Winds in the plan area are variable, but are generally driven by a land-sea breeze system with daytime on-shore and nighttime off-shore sea breezes which head northeast into and southwest out of the Glendale area. Pollutants disperse somewhat due to daytime breezes; however, a low summer inversion layer can create adverse air quality conditions and contribute to the high summer ozone levels as analyzed in the Southeast Los Angeles Community Plan (herein incorporated by reference) and the Boyle Heights Community Plan (herein incorporated by reference).

The project proposal is located in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), a non-attainment area for Federal Clean Air Standards. A recent clean air plan for the SCAB has prescribed control measures for stationary and mobile sources in order to attain federal criteria pollutant standards early in the next century. The RTI site is an active industrial site with trucks coming into the facility at intermittent intervals during operating hours. At a maximum, 30 trucks per day would be entering and leaving the site.

This project is not operating at a level of activity sufficient enough to impact or impede the attainment status for the SCAB. Potential dust from the storage and processing of tires at the RTI site is controlled indoors with a negative pressure particulate collection system. All on site tire size reduction equipment are equipped with a water misting system. Water is also used outdoors to minimize dust, which may develop during tire pile transfer operations on-site. Dust particulates have not been shown to be a problem since the site has been in operation.

IV **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (No Impact).** The RTI facility is 100% developed and has no area on site of exposed soils to support flora or fauna habitat (the entire site is paved over).

V **CULTURAL RESOURCES (No Impact).** The RTI facility is 100% developed and has no area on-site of exposed soils or area(s) proposed for excavation (the entire site is paved over).

VIa)ii) GEOLOGY AND SOILS (Less Than Significant Impact). The City Planning Department Environmental information maps do not indicate the presence of any unique geologic feature(s) in the project area. There are a number of active and potentially active faults in a regional proximity to the proposed project, such as the San Andreas Fault approximately 35 miles to the north and the Whittier Fault that occurs immediately south of the project area. The Santa Monica-Hollywood fault lies about 8 miles to the north and the active Elysian fault lies just east and south of the project area. There are other potentially active faults within the region, including the active Eagle Rock, San Rafael, and Raymond Hill faults to the north of the project area.

Seismic ground shaking could occur in the project area as a result of movement on any of these faults. The proposed project is not within a City of Los Angeles, State of California Fault Rupture Study area or the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zone. The potential for ground rupture due to fault movement in the area is low and the existing geologic materials are not likely to be susceptible to a result of the project area's inland location, tsunamis and seiches are not a hazard. The project operator does not propose to construct any new structures on site.

The project proposal is located in an area designated in the Boyle Heights Community Plan as a "Hillside Area". The Community Plan states that "Any development proposed in this area would be required to be prepared to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety, Geologic and Soils Reports dealing with erosion or mass wasting. Impacts would be addressed on a project-by-project basis." This project does not propose any new structural development and therefore would not be required to prepare a Geologic and Soils Report.

VII HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (Chemical and/or Fire Hazard; Less Than Significant Impact). There are no areas on site where fuel is stored in above or below ground tanks. Small quantities of fuel and chemicals are stored within the enclosed industrial building. To mitigate any potential for hazards related to fire or explosion the operator is required to comply with a Fire Prevention and Control Measure Plan. A 3,100-gallon per minute fire hydrant is located immediately outside the facility area on East Washington Boulevard and 25 fire extinguishers are located throughout the site. The nearest Fire Stations to the site are located at: A) 1601 South Sante Fe (less than two miles from the RTI facility), B) 4530 Bandini Blvd., C) 1967 East Caesar Chavez (also a battalion headquarters), and D) 2927 Whittier Blvd.

(Biological Nuisance: mosquitoes; Less Than Significant Impact). Rainwater accumulated in waste tires can create a mosquito breeding nuisance and a public health threat. Adult mosquitoes lay eggs in the water, which collects, within the tire wheel wells. When the eggs hatch they develop into larval "wigglers", then large numbers of adults can emerge and disperse into the surrounding areas. Adult mosquitoes seek blood meals and can potentially transmit disease. Prevention is the responsibility of the property owner. The Greater Los Angeles County Vector Control District works with landowners and operations personnel to implement Mosquito Prevention Practices.

(Biological Nuisance: rodents; No Impact). Rodents (e.g. rats) are not expected to be a nuisance at the facility because tires are not a food source for mammalian pests. No municipal solid waste will be stored on site. The facility is serviced by the local garbage collector. If a problem with rodents is detected, the operator will call a qualified pest control service to alleviate the problem.

VIII HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY (No Impact). The proposed project is not near any surface water body. The RTI facility is 100% developed and has no area on-site of exposed soils (the entire site is paved over), which could cause water infiltration or ponding. Water does not percolate into the soil but runs off the site down slope into the East Washington Boulevard street gutter and then into the storm water drainage system. No chemicals are leached from the tire materials to be transported by the surface water runoff. All chemicals are stored inside the industrial building where the majority of machinery operates. The facility is not located within an area affected by one hundred year flooding according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency maps.

IX LAND USE (No Impact). The RTI facility is 100% developed is appropriately zoned in the Boyle Heights Community Plan and the zoning is identified within the Los Angeles General Plan.

X MINERAL RESOURCES (No Impact). The RTI facility is 100% developed and has no area on-site of exposed soils nor are there areas planned for excavation nor mining (the entire site is paved over). therefore, the project proposal will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource.

XI a) NOISE (Less Than Significant Impact). The project is consistent with existing and planned land use for the M3-1 industrial zone. Ambient noise levels are impacted by the Union Pacific rail traffic and heavy truck traffic within the immediate area of the project proposal. All interior equipment is run on electricity and any noise from interior operations is attenuated by the enclosed building. Of the exterior operations equipment, the forklift runs on propane and the tractor runs on diesel. They are both used infrequently and contribute little to the ambient noise levels. Also located outside is the rasper, which continually operates on electricity. The rasper is located 50 feet south of the site boundary to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and yard. Noise levels from the Railroad tracks and yard are considerably louder than the rasper at full operation. Noise levels were measured by IWMB staff on November 1, 2000, at nearest boundary to the rasper. During full operational capacity the rasper produced noise levels measured at or below 70 dBA on the noise meter. This noise level is not considered significant for a 'heavy manufacturing' zone. Operational hours are Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. The nearest sensitive receptor/residence is located at the corner of Olympic Boulevard and Grande Vista, approximately 1,800 feet from the northernmost boundary of the RTI facility.

XII POPULATION AND HOUSING (No Impact). The proposed project is not the type of operation which would require a substantial increase in the existing employable workforce; therefore the project will not intensify the residential density within the project area. The

proposed project will not result in ascendance of local growth projections, nor induce growth. The project will not displace housing as long as the requirements in the Fire Prevention Plan are adhered to.

XIII PUBLIC SERVICES (No Impact). The proposed project is not the type of operation which would require additional infrastructure (fire, police, schools, parks, etc.) to support a substantial increase in the population. In the event of a fire at the facility, access is provided to emergency vehicles and personnel, as required in the Fire Prevention Plan.

XIV RECREATION (No Impact). The proposed project is not the type of operation which would increase the population requiring additional recreational facilities.

XVa) TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC (Less Than Significant Impact). The proposed maximum 30 trucks is less than 1% of the operating traffic on the East Washington Boulevard. This volume is considered not significant to either street traffic levels or cross-street signaling levels of service for a single facility located within the M3-1 Zone. The project is not anticipated to significant increase traffic patterns, nor creates hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians.

XVI UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS (No Impact). The proposed project is already serviced and supplied with utilities. The proposed facility expansion does not include an increase in any on site equipment nor demand for services. The facility will not require any additional infrastructure.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA



RICHARD J. RIORDAN
MAYOR

ROBERT JANOVICI
CHIEF ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
ASSOCIATE ZONING ADMINISTRATORS
EMILY J. GABEL-LUDDY
DANIEL GREEN
LOURDES GREEN
ALBERT LANGINI
LEONARD S. LEVINE
JON PERICA
SARAH A. ROGERS
HORACE E. TRAMEL JR.

DEPARTMENT OF
CITY PLANNING
CON HOWE
DIRECTOR

FRANKLIN P. EBERHARD
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

OFFICE OF
ZONING ADMINISTRATION

221 NORTH FIGUEROA STREET
ROOM 1500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-2501
(213) 580-5495
FAX: (213) 380-5588

April 24, 1997

Charlotte Sabeh
Tire Unit - Permit Enforcement
California Integrated Waste
Management Board
8800 Cal Center Drive
Sacramento, CA 95826

RUBBER TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL (RTI)

This letter will confirm that the property at 3185 East Washington Boulevard is in the M3-1 zoning category under the City's zoning regulations. As such the shredding, cutting and processing of used tires down to their component ingredients is permitted by right under the zoning regulations of the City and no discretionary land use entitlements are necessary in order to establish this use.

This being the case, the City would not require nor issue an environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Daniel Green for RJ
ROBERT JANOVICI
Chief Zoning Administrator

RJ:mw

Enclosure

cc: Fred Schmidt
RTI
3185 East Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90023

Post-It Fax Note	7671	Date	4/25	# of pages	3
To	Fred Schmidt	From	Zoning Admin		
Co/Dept	RTI	Co.			
Phone #		Phone #	580-5495		
Fax #	268-7328	Fax #			




CITY HALL
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 847-2489

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

RICHARD J. RIORDAN
MAYOR

September 18, 1998

Fred Schmidt
Rubber Technology International
3185 East Washington Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90023



Mr. Schmidt:

I am writing to update you on my progress in assisting you with your permit renewal with the California Integrate Waste Management Board. I have spoken with Jeannie Blakeslee in order to clarify exactly what the Board is looking for. In addition, my Expediter, Perry Singerman has spoken with his contacts at the State level in order to determine whether or not this information is in fact crucial to your permit renewal.

In order to assist us further with our communications with the Board, it would be helpful to obtain copies of your current state permits. Please mail or fax this information to me as soon as possible; or, if you do not currently have permits, please let us know so that we can best help you resolve this issue in a quick fashion. I look forward to receiving this information. My fax number is: 213-847-0893, and I can be reached by phone at: 213-847-4406.

Sincerely,

Kacy Collons Keys, Esq.
Business Development Representative

0003.rti

Sue/John L.



South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 E. Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182
(909) 396-2000 • <http://www.aqmd.gov>


Information Management
Public Records Unit

Direct Dial (909) 396-3700
Fax: (909) 396-3330

COMPLETION LETTER

December 13, 2000

JOHN LOANE
CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
P.O. BOX 4025 (100 I STREET)
SACRAMENTO, CA 95812 - 4025



Ref.: CONTROL NO. 6674

Re: PERMITS, EQL, EMISSIONS SUMMARY FOR RUBBER
TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL, INC., 3185 EAST
WASHINGTON BLVD, LOS ANGELES, CA 90023(JAN.1, 1998-
DEC.8,2000)

Your request for records dated December 08, 2000 was received and processed. After a thorough search of our records:

NO REQUESTED RECORDS WERE FOUND FOR THE ABOVE-
REFERENCED FACILITY OR FACILITY SITE.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me, Tuesday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA REYESx3025
For Linda L. Mills
Public Records Coordinator

LLM: VR

PROOF OF PUBLICATION
(2015.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
County of Los Angeles,

DEC 20 2000
BY: *[Signature]*

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of the

Daily News

a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published 7 times weekly in the Cities of Los Angeles, Burbank & San Fernando; County of Los Angeles, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, under the date of May 26, 1983, Case Number Adjudication #C349217; that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpareil), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:.....

Dec 15,

all in the year 20 *00*

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated at Woodland Hills,

California, this *15th* day of *Dec*, 20 *00*

[Signature]
Signature

(DAILY NEWS)
PUBLIC NOTICE

Availability of a Proposed Negative Declaration for the Issuance of a Major Waste Tire Facility Permit (SWIS 19-TF-0001) at the Rubber Technology International, Inc., a waste tire storage and processing facility in the City of Los Angeles. The proposal is to increase the facility in size from 2.0 acres to 2.72 acres, and increase the amount of tires stored on site from approximately 4,999 to 30,000. State Clearinghouse # (to be assigned). The California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) is the lead agency for this project.

Proof of Publication

below:
California Integrated Waste Management Board, Environmental Review Section, Permitting and Enforcement Division, P.O. Box 4025, Sacramento, CA 95812-4025, Attention: John Loane

The final filing date for written comments is January 11, 2001. Comments should be submitted in writing to the above addresses. Following the public review period on the proposed ND, all comments will be considered by the CIWMB prior to a decision on the adoption of the ND and subsequent issuance of the Major Waste Tire Facility Permit. Consideration of the adoption of the ND is scheduled for January 23 or 24, 2001, at the IWMB Board Room, First Floor, 8800 Cal Center Drive, in Sacramento. If there are any questions, please contact John Loane at (916) 341-6327.

Publish December 15, 2000

California Integrated Waste Management Board, Environmental Review Section, Permitting and Enforcement Division, P.O. Box 4025, Sacramento, CA 95812-4025, Attention: John Loane. This document is being made available to the public at: City of Los Angeles, Planning Department, 201 North Figueroa, Los Angeles, CA 90012. This document is also being circulated to appropriate State Agencies by the State Clearinghouse. Copies of the proposed ND are also available by request to the lead agency at the location indicated below: California Integrated Waste Management Board, Environmental Review Section, Permitting and Enforcement Division, P.O. Box 4025, Sacramento, CA 95812-4025, Attention: John Loane.



California Integrated Waste Management Board

Linda Moulton-Patterson, Chair
1001 I Street • Sacramento, California 95814 • (916) 341-6000
www.ciwmb.ca.gov



Gray Davis
Governor

Winston H. Hickox
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

Date: December 13, 2000

To: Mr. Fred Schmidt

Subject: Proposed Negative Declaration (ND) for the approval of a new Waste Tire Facility Permit (SWIS #19-TI-0681) from a Minor to a Major Waste Tire facility at the Rubber Technology International, Inc. (RTI) in the City and County of Los Angeles.

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (IWMB or Board), acting as Lead Agency, has determined that preparation of an ND would be appropriate for the project referenced above. The ND was prepared in accordance with the information provided by the applicant (RTI) and the assessment by IWMB's Environmental Review Section (ERS) staff through the analysis in the Initial Study. ERS staff used the Checklist (IS) to: 1) identify potential environmental effects that might result from this proposed project; 2) determine whether any such impacts are significant; 3) ascertain whether significant impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance in compliance with the CEQA Statutes and Guidelines; and 4) determine whether to prepare a Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project.

The ND is being forwarded to responsible and trustee agencies for review and comment in compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Sections 15063(g) and 15071. Review and comments are requested to ensure that the environmental decision by the Board will reflect the concerns of State Agencies involved with the project. The Lead Agency will consider comments along with the ND and vote on adoption of the ND and the issuance of the Waste Tire Facility Permit (WTFP).

If a response is not received from your Agency by 5:00 p.m. on January 14, 2001, as required in CEQA Guidelines, CCR Section 15074(b), this Agency will assume that your Agency has no comment. **Should you have any questions, please contact John Loane, Integrated Waste Management Specialist of the ERS, Permitting & Enforcement Division at (916) 341-6327.**

Enclosures